



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/608,515

06/26/2003

Brett Error

6067-47301

9313

65132

7590

07/22/2010

M.H.K.K.G., P.C. / ADOBE SYSTEMS INCORPORATED

P.O. BOX 398

AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER

FRITZ, BRADFORD F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2442

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/22/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patent_docketing@intprop.com

ptomhkg@gmail.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/608,515	Applicant(s) ERROR ET AL.	
	Examiner BRADFORD F. FRITZ	Art Unit 2442	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 18-26 and 30-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 18-26 and 30-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, filed 4/08/2010, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-12, 18-23, 25-26, and 30-36 have been fully considered and are persuasive.

Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Durham (6,330,566), in view of Cui et al. (6,910,180), hereinafter referred to as Cui, further in view of Farber et al. (6,185,598), and Albert et al. (2002/0141401).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 3-8, 11-12, 19, 20, 25-26, 34, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Durham (6,330,566), in view of Farber et al. (6,185,598), hereinafter referred to as Farber, further in view of Albert et al. (2002/0141401), hereinafter referred to as Albert.

4. Regarding claims 3 and 19, Durham disclosed a.) receiving a request for a resource from a requester, the requester having an address (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2); and sending to the requester a redirection request including the new

Art Unit: 2442

visitor identifier and an indicator that redirection has already been performed (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), c.2) responsive to determining that the request does not include an indicator that redirection has already been performed: assigning a new visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2); and sending to the requester a redirection request including the new visitor identifier and an indicator that redirection has already been performed (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), the redirection request being adapted to cause the requestor to retransmit the request for the resource (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

However, Durham does not explicitly teach responsive to determining that the request does not include a visitor identifier and responsive to determining that the request does not include a visitor identifier: c.1) determining that the request does not include an indicator that redirection has already been performed, where redirection comprises: assigning a new visitor identifier; assigning a new visitor identifier.

Farber teaches responsive to determining that the request does not include a visitor identifier and responsive to determining that the request does not include a visitor identifier: c.1) determining that the request does not include an indicator that redirection has already been performed (column 16, lines 27-45 and Fig. 3), where redirection comprises: assigning a new visitor identifier (column 16, lines 27-45 and Fig. 3); assigning a new visitor identifier (column 16, lines 27-45 and Fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Farber in the combination above because all are from the same field of endeavor and in order to avoid all requests going to the origin server or cause all

Art Unit: 2442

requests to go to the repeater causing the repeater to redundantly request resources which could not be cached (column 16, lines 27-45).

However, the combination does not explicitly teach wherein the indicator that redirection has occurred is provided separate from the visitor identifier

Albert teaches wherein the indicator that redirection has occurred is provided separate from the visitor identifier (paragraphs 0118-0130). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Albert in the combination above because all are from the same field of endeavor and in order to between dispatched and directed traffic (paragraph 0129).

5. Regarding claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, and 20 Durham disclosed a method wherein the visitor identifier comprises a cookie (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

6. Regarding claim 5, Durham disclosed a method wherein determining whether the request for the resource included a visitor identifier further comprises the steps of: comparing the visitor identifier with a range of valid visitor identifiers (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 104), and, in response to the visitor identifier being outside the range of valid visitor identifiers (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 104), indicating that the request did not include the visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 104).

7. Regarding claim 7, Durham disclosed categorizing data sent with the request for the resource by at least one selected from the group consisting of a visitor identifier, a page identifier, and a time stamp (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

Art Unit: 2442

8. Regarding claim 11, Durham disclosed a communication interface for receiving a request for a resource from a requestor and sending a visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2); a cookie handler coupled to the communications interface for performing the steps of: a) determining whether the request includes a visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), b.1) determining whether the request includes an indicator that redirection has already been performed (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), where redirection comprises: assigning a new visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2); and sending to the requester a redirection request including the new visitor identifier and an indicator that redirection has already been performed and causing the communication interface to send to the requestor a redirection request including the new visitor identifier and an indicator that redirection has already been performed (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), wherein the indicator that redirection has already been performed is provided separate from the visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), the redirection request being adapted to cause the requestor to retransmit the request for the resource (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2); and a session controller coupled to the cookie handler for signaling a session end for a particular visitor identifier (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2); and a repository for: storing data sent with the request for the resource (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

However, Durham does not explicitly teach responsive to determining that the request does not include an indicator that redirection has already been performed: assigning a new visitor identifier.

Farber teaches responsive to determining that the request does not include an indicator that redirection has already been performed: assigning a new visitor identifier (column 16, lines 27-45 and Fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Farber in the combination above because all are from the same field of endeavor and in order to avoid all requests going to the origin server or cause all requests to go to the repeater causing the repeater to redundantly request resources which could not be cached (column 16, lines 27-45).

However, the combination does not explicitly teach wherein the indicator that redirection has occurred is provided separate from the visitor identifier.

Albert teaches wherein the indicator that redirection has occurred is provided separate from the visitor identifier (paragraphs 0118-0130). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Albert in the combination above because all are from the same field of endeavor and in order to between dispatched and directed traffic (paragraph 0129).

9. Regarding claims 25, Durham disclosed wherein the received request identifies a resource (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), and the redirection request identifies the same resource identified by the received request (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

Art Unit: 2442

10. Regarding claims 26, Durham disclosed wherein the received request identifies an address (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), and the redirection request identifies the address identified by the received request (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

11. Regarding claims 34 and 36, Cui teaches responsive to determining that the request does include an indicator that redirection has already been performed: assigning a visitor identifier based on the requestor's address (column 1, lines 57 – column 2, line 25); determining that the requestor does not accept visitor identifiers (column 1, lines 57 – column 2, line 25); and causing the communication interface to transmit the requested resource to the requestor (column 1, lines 57 – column 2, line 25).

12. Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 18, 21-23, 30-33, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Durham (6,330,566), in view of Cui et al. (6,910,180), hereinafter referred to as Cui, in view of Farber et al. (6,185,598), hereinafter referred to as Farber, further in view of Albert et al. (2002/0141401), hereinafter referred to as Albert.

13. Regarding claim 1, Durham disclosed a.) receiving a request for a resource (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 100), the request originating at a client (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2 item 100); b.) determining that the request for the resource does not include a visitor identifier and does not include an indicator that redirection has occurred (column 7, lines 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2,

Art Unit: 2442

item 102); sending a redirection request with the new visitor identifier to the client, the redirection request comprising an indicator that redirection has occurred (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), and transmitting the requested resource to the client (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

However, Durham does not explicitly teach determining that redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and that the client did not store the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request; responsive to determining that redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and that the client did not store the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request, determining that the client does not accept visitor identifiers.

Cui teaches determining that redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and that the client did not store the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request (column 1, lines 57 – column 2, line 25); responsive to determining that redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and that the client did not store the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request (column 1, lines 57 – column 2, line 25), determining that the client does not accept visitor identifiers (column 1, lines 57 – column 2, line 25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Cui in Durham because both are from the same field of endeavor and in order to decide whether or not to provide cookie service (column 1, lines 57-65).

However, the combination does not explicitly teach responsive to determining that the request does not include a visitor identifier and does not include an indicator that redirection has occurred: assigning a new visitor identifier.

Farber teaches responsive to determining that the request does not include a visitor identifier and does not include an indicator that redirection has occurred: assigning a new visitor identifier (column 16, lines 27-45 and Fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Farber in the combination above because all are from the same field of endeavor and in order to avoid all requests going to the origin server or cause all requests to go to the repeater causing the repeater to redundantly request resources which could not be cached (column 16, lines 27-45).

However, the combination does not explicitly teach wherein the indicator that redirection has occurred is provided separate from the visitor identifier,

Albert teaches wherein the indicator that redirection has occurred is provided separate from the visitor identifier (paragraphs 0118-0130). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Albert in the combination above because all are from the same field of endeavor and in order to between dispatched and directed traffic (paragraph 0129).

14. Regarding claim 18, Durham disclosed a.) receiving a request for a resource, the request originating at a client (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2); b.) determining whether the request for the resource includes a visitor identifier and an indicator that redirection has already occurred (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14,

Art Unit: 2442

Fig. 2); sending a redirection request with the new visitor identifier to the client (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), the redirection request including an indicator that redirection has occurred (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), and transmitting the requested resource to the client (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

However, Durham does not explicitly teach determining whether redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and whether the client stored the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request; responsive to determining that redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and that the client did not store the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request determining that the client does not accept visitor identifiers.

Cui teaches determining whether redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and whether the client stored the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request (column 1, lines 57 – column 2, line 25); responsive to determining that redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and that the client did not store the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request determining that the client does not accept visitor identifiers (column 1, lines 57 – column 2, line 25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Cui in Durham because both are from the same field of endeavor and in order to decide whether or not to provide cookie service (column 1, lines 57-65).

However, the combination does not explicitly teach c.) responsive to determining that the request does not include a visitor identifier and does not include an indicator that redirection has occurred: assigning a new visitor identifier.

Farber teaches c.) responsive to determining that the request does not include a visitor identifier and does not include an indicator that redirection has occurred: assigning a new visitor identifier (column 16, lines 27-45 and Fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Farber in the combination above because all are from the same field of endeavor and in order to avoid all requests going to the origin server or cause all requests to go to the repeater causing the repeater to redundantly request resources which could not be cached (column 16, lines 27-45).

However, the combination does not explicitly teach wherein the indicator that redirection has occurred is provided separate from the visitor identifier.

Albert teaches wherein the indicator that redirection has occurred is provided separate from the visitor identifier (paragraphs 0118-0130). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Albert in the combination above because all are from the same field of endeavor and in order to between dispatched and directed traffic (paragraph 0129).

15. Regarding claims 2, Durham disclosed a method wherein the visitor identifier comprises a cookie (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

16. Regarding claim 9, Durham disclosed repeating steps a-d for a predetermined amount of time (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

17. Regarding claim 10, Durham disclosed repeating steps a-d until receiving a particular request for a resource (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

18. Regarding claim 21, Durham disclosed wherein the received request identifies a resource (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), and the redirection request identifies the same resource identified by the received request (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

19. Regarding claims 22, Durham disclosed wherein the received request identifies an address (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2), and the redirection request identifies the address identified by the received request (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

20. Regarding claim 23, Durham wherein sending a redirection request comprises sending a redirection request including an indicator that step c) has been performed (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

21. Regarding claims 30 and 31, Durham disclosed repeating steps a-c until reaching a session expiration (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 14, Fig. 2).

22. Regarding claim 32, Farber disclosed receiving another request for a resource, the another request originating at a client (column 16, lines 27-45, column 23, lines 25-50, and Fig. 3); determining that the another request for the resource does not include a visitor identifier and does not include an indicator that redirection has occurred (column 16, lines 27-45, column 23, lines 25-50, and Fig. 3); responsive to determining that the another request does not include a visitor identifier and does not include an indicator that redirection has occurred: assigning a new visitor identifier (column 16,

Art Unit: 2442

lines 27-45, column 23, lines 25-50, and Fig. 3); sending a redirection request with the new visitor identifier to the client (column 16, lines 27-45, column 23, lines 25-50, and Fig. 3), the redirection request comprising an indicator that redirection has occurred (column 16, lines 27-45, column 23, lines 25-50, and Fig. 3), determining that redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and that the client did store the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request (column 16, lines 27-45, column 23, lines 25-50, and Fig. 3); transmitting the requested resource to the client (column 16, lines 27-45, column 23, lines 25-50, and Fig. 3).

However, Farber does not explicitly teach responsive to determining that redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and that the client did store the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request, determining that the client does accept visitor identifiers.

Cui teaches responsive to determining that redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and that the client did store the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request, determining that the client does accept visitor identifiers (column 1, lines 57 – column 2, line 25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Cui in the combination above because both are from the same field of endeavor and in order to decide whether or not to provide cookie service (column 1, lines 57-65).

However, the combination does not explicitly teach wherein the indicator that redirection has occurred is provided separate from the visitor identifier.

Albert teaches wherein the indicator that redirection has occurred is provided separate from the visitor identifier (paragraphs 0118-0130). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Albert in the combination above because all are from the same field of endeavor and in order to between dispatched and directed traffic (paragraph 0129).

23. Regarding claim 33, Farber disclosed d.) receiving another request for a resource from a requestor, the requestor having an address (column 16, lines 27-45, column 23, lines 25-50, and Fig. 3); e.) determining that the another request does not include a visitor identifier (column 16, lines 27-45, column 23, lines 25-50, and Fig. 3); f.) responsive to determining that the another request does not include a visitor identifier f.1) determining that the another request does include an indicator that redirection has already been performed (column 16, lines 27-45, column 23, lines 25-50, and Fig. 3); f.2) responsive to determining that the request does include an indicator that redirection has already been performed: assigning a visitor identifier based on the requestor's address; and transmitting the requested resource to the requestor (column 16, lines 27-45, column 23, lines 25-50, and Fig. 3).

However, the combination does not explicitly teach determining that the client does accept visitor identifiers.

Cui teaches determining that the client does accept visitor identifiers (column 1, lines 57 – column 2, line 25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features as taught by Cui in the

Art Unit: 2442

combination above because both are from the same field of endeavor and in order to decide whether or not to provide cookie service (column 1, lines 57-65).

24. Regarding claim 35, Cui teaches responsive to determining that redirection has occurred in accordance with the redirection request and that the client did store the new visitor identifier sent with the redirection request (column 1, lines 57 – column 2, line 25), determining that the client does accept visitor identifiers (column 1, lines 57 – column 2, line 25).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2442

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRADFORD F. FRITZ whose telephone number is (571)272-3860. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Philip Lee can be reached on 571-272-3967. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/B. F. F./
Examiner, Art Unit 2442

/Philip C Lee/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2448